



## Education Data Division - Request for Change Form for CBDS

### Section 1 - Details of Change

(To be completed by the RFC Originator / CBDS Administrator)

<b>Project / Service:</b> CBDS	<b>Type of Change:</b> Change to a CodeSet	<b>RFC</b> 713
<b>Name and team/company of RFC Originator:</b> Amanda Robinson, Data Development Unit, Education Data Division		
<b>Originator Contact No:</b> 01325 735392	<b>Originator email address:</b> Amanda.robinson@education.gsi.gov.uk	
<b>Date RFC Raised:</b> 19/05/14	<b>Date change required:</b> Change required for CTF Next CBDS Update	
<b>Priority:</b> 3	<b>1 = Top</b> - Ministerial or legislative requirement  <b>2 = High</b> - Senior official customer requirement or clear net benefit / efficiency saving to EDD, department or MIS suppliers  <b>3 = Medium</b> - Customer requirement, marginal net benefit  <b>4 = Low</b> - Nice to have, net cost, does not affect functionality, cosmetic change	
<b>EDD Contact:</b> Queries.SUPPLIER@education.gsi.gov.uk		
<b>Change Title:</b> Guardian code to be added to the Relationship CodeSet (D00033)		

**Data item / Rule Number:**

Relationship CodeSet - D00033

**Description of change:**

Guardian code to be added to the Relationship code set of the CBDS (D00033) to cover 'Special Guardianship Orders'.

<b>D00033</b>	<b>Relationship</b>
CAR	Carer
CHM	Childminder
DOC	Doctor
FAM	Other family member
FOF	Foster Father
FOM	Foster Mother
HTC	Head Teacher
OTH	Other Contact
PAF	Father
PAM	Mother
REL	Other Relative
RLG	Religious/Spiritual Contact
STF	Step Father
STM	Step Mother
SWR	Social Worker
TCH	Teacher

<b>D00xxx</b>	<b>Relationship</b>
CAR	Carer
CHM	Childminder
DOC	Doctor
FAM	Other family member
FOF	Foster Father
FOM	Foster Mother
<b>GUA</b>	<b>Guardian</b>
HTC	Head Teacher
OTH	Other Contact
PAF	Father
PAM	Mother
REL	Other Relative
RLG	Religious/Spiritual Contact
STF	Step Father
STM	Step Mother
SWR	Social Worker
TCH	Teacher

**Reason for change (including benefits):**

A Special Guardianship Order appoints a person or couple to be a child's special guardian(s). It is a legal status that is more permanent than long term fostering and the child is no longer looked after by the local authority (therefore we can't use the foster parent codes). However, there is not the legal severance with the birth family that there would be for an adoption and therefore the guardian would not fit as (adoptive) parent on the code set either.

It is assumed that the Carer code is for a carer of a child with a disability so is not suitable.

Further information about Special Guardianship Orders can be found

[at:https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/236264/special\\_guardianship\\_guidance.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/236264/special_guardianship_guidance.pdf)

For example section 14 refers to the 'special guardian'.

**Impact of not doing the change:**

Schools may have been using a 'best fit' code to record children that fall into the category of special guardian/s as this is not detailed in the relationship CodeSet.

**ISB view of the proposed change:**

It is difficult to comment when the usage of the codeset is not explained. A distinction is made between the various legal statuses and it is shown that Guardian status differs from others in the old list. However it is not explained what decisions must be made by a school or actions taken that would differ depending on the exact legal status of the relation. In aspects of delivering the child to a responsible person, or informing of accidents and emergencies, would the action taken for a Legal Guardian be different to the actions taken for a Foster Parent? If not, why ask the school to record these distinctions?

**Funding availability:**

N/A

**Impact assessment to be undertaken by:**

Core software suppliers

Working Group

ISB

**Date consulted:**

19/05/14

**Response requested by:**

27/05/14

## Section 2 - Impact Analysis

### (To be completed by Impact Assessors)

#### Software Suppliers' Summary of Impact Assessment:

Supplier 1 - I have no issues with these RFCs as they're simply code set changes which are very easy to implement. I presume that the ISB will make the appropriate changes to their controlled lists?

Supplier 2 - RFC 713

I've just got two queries regarding this change request:

- When would you expect the new codeset to be valid from? [valid from September 2014](#)
- If this change is expected to be in place in our software before the CTF 14 update this would require an update to CTF13 to allow the transfer of 'Guardian' [Gerry is the CTF contact, I have asked Gerry to provide a response.](#)

[Response was made to Supplier 2 on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2014 as above.](#)

#### DfE Internal Colleagues' Summary of Impact Assessment:

N/A

**Alternative Solutions / Workarounds (if appropriate):**

I have written to the originator with the following:

**The following update was sent to the originator – as a result of this the originator has agreed that the change is not required.**

I have done some further investigation for your request to add a Guardian code to be added to the Relationship code set of the CBDS (D00033) to cover Special Guardianship Orders and have found the following:

If a sibling or any other family member is the child’s legal guardian then the school should record this as ‘Other Family Member’ and parent responsibility will be flagged as ‘true’. If the legal guardian is not a member of the child’s family, then ‘other contact’ can be used and again with parental responsibility flagged as true. *This is from FAQ’s when we collected the information in 2009.*

The following codes can also have ‘true’ for parental responsibility:

- CAR Carer
- CHM Childminder
- DOC Doctor
- FAM Other Family Member
- HTC Head Teacher
- OTH Other Contact
- REL Other Relative
- RLG Religious/Spiritual Contact
- SWR Social Worker
- TCH Teacher

*This is from the School Census guidance in 2009.*

Both would have been published at the time of the collections. Is this sufficient rather than changing the CBDS for something we no longer collect?

**The originator has responded stating that the change is no longer a requirement based on the information above.**

**Estimated Cost of Change:**

N/A

**Impact Assessed by (name):**

**Date:**

Core software suppliers

27/05/14

Working Group

ISB

**Section 3 - Outcome / Decision**

**(To be completed CBDS administrator)**

**Review Meeting:** CBDS administrator review

<b>Attendees:</b> Lisa Beadle, Amanda Robinson	<b>Date of Review Meeting:</b> 04/06/14
<b>Brief Summary of Discussion:</b> It was agreed that this RFC would be rejected as 'Other Contact' should be used.	
<b>Accept / Reject:</b> Reject	<b>Deferred to:</b> n/a
<b>Type of Funding:</b> n/a	<b>Fund Holder Agreement:</b> n/a
<b>If Defer, provide details</b> n/a	
<b>If Accept, provide details:</b>	
<b>If Reject, provide details:</b> It was agreed that this RFC would be rejected as 'Other Contact' should be used	

© Crown copyright 2014